UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

2.4

```
11 ANDRE L. HART,

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 J. CELAYA, et al.,

Defendant(s).

16
```

Having received plaintiff's September 13, 2007 request for an extension to time to file his reply to defendant's initial opposition, and in light of Judge Wilken's September 17 Order [Docket No. 72], IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- My Second Briefing Order, dated August 27, 2007, is
 VACATED;
- 2. In his reply to defendant's opposition, to be filed as directed by Judge Wilken in her September 17 Order, plaintiff will inform the Court whether his second motion to compel discovery, Docket No. 59, replaces his initial motion to compel discovery, Docket No. 25, entirely so that there is no need to rule on the initial motion.

- 3. If plaintiff wants a ruling on his initial motion, he must include an explanation of how his second motion to compel discovery, and the documents sought therein, differs from his initial motion to compel discovery.
- 4. In addition, plaintiff must identify all of the documents that he is still seeking and the information that he seeks to obtain from these documents. This shall include, but not be limited to, an explanation of whether and to what extent access to his central file and medical file have satisfied his production requests, and why the medical and disciplinary procedures and polices already provided by defendants are insufficient.
- 5. If necessary, the court will schedule a hearing. Dated: September 21, 2007

Bernard Zimmerman

United States Magistrate Judge

G:\BZALL\-REFS\HART\VACATE BRIEFING ORDER 2.wpd